



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*clo*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/574,637	05/18/2000	John J. Johnson IV	30603UT1002	8108
5179	7590	03/29/2004	EXAMINER	
PEACOCK MYERS AND ADAMS P C P O BOX 26927 ALBUQUERQUE, NM 871256927			HWU, DAVIS D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3752	

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004

*30*

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/574,637

Applicant(s)

JOHNSON, JOHN J.

Examiner

Davis Hwu

Art Unit

3752

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 41-45 and 48-109 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 42, 49 and 50 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 41, 43-45, 48 and 51-109 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 3752

***Response to Amendment***

1. The allowance of claims 41-59 is hereby withdrawn.
2. Claims 42, 49, 50 are previously non-elected claims in amendment filed April 1, 2002.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 41, 43, 48, 52, 56-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr.

The patent to Veath, Sr. discloses a vehicle including a fluid delivery tank comprising a modular auxiliary tank, an engine, and three wheels (Column 6, lines 44-45) making a triangular wheel base as recited in claim 39. Each of the three wheels is driven by its own hydraulic motor (Column 7, lines 4-11), which will provide left and right brakes wherein the brakes comprise separate controllability. Veath, Sr. does not disclose the vehicle as being a fire-fighting emergency response vehicle, however, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations.

Veath, Sr. does not disclose the dimensions as recited. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have made the front wheel according to dimensions claimed,

Art Unit: 3752

since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component which is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art when there is no disclosure as to the criticality of such a modification.

5. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Bolton et al.

The patent to Veath, Sr. discloses the instant invention except for the at least one window being resistant to fire. The patent to Bolton et al. teaches providing fire resistant windows to vehicles for fire protection. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. by providing a fire resistant window as taught by Bolton et al. for fire protection.

6. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Atkins.

The patent to Veath, Sr. discloses the instant invention except for the chain and sprocket steering mechanism. The patent to Atkins teaches a vehicle having a chain and sprocket steering system. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated into the vehicle of Veath, Sr. a chain and sprocket steering system as taught by Atkins since Atkins teaches that such arrangements are known to one of ordinary skill in the art and the vehicle of Veath, Sr. would function properly with such arrangements.

7. Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Carrier.

Art Unit: 3752

The patent to Carrier teaches a fire fighting vehicle having a tank with fire-retarding chemicals which is capable of producing at least 34,000 liters of fire-suppressing foam. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the vehicle of Veath, Sr. by providing enough chemicals in order to produce at least 34,000 liters of foam as taught by Carrier in order to provide adequate amounts of fire fighting foam.

8. Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Forsyth.

The patent to Forsyth teaches a fire fighting vehicle which is capable of being airlifted to a destination. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the vehicle of Veath, Sr. by providing at least one attachment point for airlifting and airdropping the vehicle as taught by Forsyth in order to quickly place the vehicle a particular location to fight fires.

9. Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Willard, Jr.

The patent to Veath, Sr. discloses the instant invention except for the runflat tires as recited. The patent to Willard, Jr. teaches a run-flat tire which demonstrates improved vehicle performance under deflated conditions and yet achieves the same vehicle performance as a standard tire when inflated. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. by using runflat tires as taught by Willard, Jr. in order to provide

Art Unit: 3752

demonstrates improved vehicle performance under deflated conditions and achieve the same vehicle performance as a standard tire when inflated.

10. Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Matsushita.

The patent to Veath, Sr. discloses the instant invention except for the left and right brakes and the brakes comprising separate controllability. The patent to Matsushita teaches a vehicle steering control system comprising left and right brakes and control valves for separately controlling the left and right brakes in order to obtain smooth turning performance. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. by incorporating left and right brakes wherein the brakes are separately controlled as taught by Matsushita in order to provide a smooth turning performance.

11. Claims 60, 62, 66, 68, 72-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Arnold.

The patent to Veath, Sr. discloses the instant invention except for the front wheel comprising a 360 degree rotatability as recited. The patent to Arnold teaches a vehicle comprising a steering system which provides a 360 degree rotatability about an axis substantially orthogonal to the axis of rotation of the wheels for translational movement of the vehicle (Column 5, lines 13-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. by providing a 360 degree rotatability for the front wheel as taught by Arnold for translational movement of the vehicle. Veath, Sr. does not disclose the

Art Unit: 3752

vehicle as being a fire-fighting emergency response vehicle, however, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations and the tank of Veath, Sr. can be used to carry fire fighting fluids. Providing a wedge shaped front nose as recited in claim 72 is a matter of design choice since it involves a change in the shape of an object which is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art and the weight recited in claim 75 would have been an obvious matter of design choice depending on the desired weight of the vehicle.

12. Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Arnold as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of Fuller.

Fuller teaches a fire fighting vehicle comprising a frame 12 supporting a removable tank 16. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. and Arnold by providing the recited limitations such the tank is removable from the vehicle since this concept is taught by Fuller in order to clean or replace the tank as necessary.

13. Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Arnold as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of Bolton et al.

The patent to Bolton et al. teaches providing fire resistant windows to vehicles for fire protection. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. and Arnold by

Art Unit: 3752

providing a fire resistant window as taught by Bolton et al. for heat protection since the coating materials are often very hot when spread.

14. Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Arnold as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of Atkins.

The patent to Atkins teaches a vehicle having a chain and sprocket steering system. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated into the vehicle of Veath, Sr. and Arnold a chain and sprocket steering system as taught by Atkins since Atkins teaches that such arrangements are known to one of ordinary skill in the art and the vehicle of Veath, Sr. and Arnold would function properly with such arrangements.

15. Claim 65 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Arnold as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of Fuller.

Fuller teaches a fire fighting vehicle comprising a frame 12 supporting a removable tank

16. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. and Arnold by providing the recited limitations such the tank is removable from the vehicle since this concept is taught by Fuller in order to clean or replace the tank as necessary.

16. Claim 67 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Arnold as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of Carrier.

The patent to Carrier teaches a fire fighting vehicle having a tank with fire-retarding chemicals which is capable of producing at least 34,000 liters of fire-suppressing foam. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the



Art Unit: 3752

invention was made to have modified the vehicle of Veath, Sr. and Arnold by providing enough chemicals in order to produce at least 34,000 liters of foam as taught by Carrier in order to provide adequate amounts of fire fighting foam.

17. Claim 69 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Arnold as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of Forsyth.

The patent to Forsyth teaches a fire fighting vehicle which is capable of being airlifted to a destination. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the vehicle of Veath, Sr. Arnold by providing at least one attachment point for airlifting and airdropping the vehicle as taught by Forsyth in order to quickly place the vehicle a particular location to fight fires.

18. Claim 70 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Arnold as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of Willard, Jr.

Willard, Jr. teaches a run-flat tire which demonstrates improved vehicle performance under deflated conditions and yet achieves the same vehicle performance as a standard tire when inflated. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. and Arnold by using runflat tires as taught by Willard, Jr. in order to provide demonstrates improved vehicle performance under deflated conditions and achieve the same vehicle performance as a standard tire when inflated.

19. Claim 71 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Arnold as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of Matsushita.

Art Unit: 3752

Matsushita teaches a vehicle steering control system comprising left and right brakes and control valves for separately controlling the left and right brakes in order to obtain smooth turning performance. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. and Arnold by incorporating left and right brakes wherein the brakes are separately controlled as taught by Matsushita in order to provide a smooth turning performance.

20. Claims 76, 78, 81, 84, 85, 86, 89-92 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Matsushita.

The patent to Veath, Sr. discloses the instant invention except for the left and right brakes and the brakes comprising separate controllability. The patent to Matsushita teaches a vehicle steering control system comprising left and right brakes and control valves for separately controlling the left and right brakes in order to obtain smooth turning performance. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. by incorporating left and right brakes wherein the brakes are separately controlled as taught by Matsushita in order to provide a smooth turning performance. The size as recited in claim 81 would have been an obvious matter design choice depending on the desired wheel size. Providing a wedge shaped front nose as recited in claim 89 is a matter of design choice since it involves a change in the shape of an object which is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art and the weight recited in claim 92 would have been an obvious matter of design choice depending on the desired weight of the vehicle.

Art Unit: 3752

21. Claims 77 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Matsushita as applied to claim 76 above, and further in view of Fuller.

Fuller teaches a fire fighting vehicle comprising a frame 12 supporting a removable tank 16. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. and Matsushita by providing the recited limitations such the tank is removable from the vehicle since this concept is taught by Fuller in order to clean or replace the tank as necessary.

22. Claim 79 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Matsushita as applied to claim 76 above, and further in view of Bolton et al.

The patent to Bolton et al. teaches providing fire resistant windows to vehicles for fire protection. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. and Matsushita by providing a fire resistant window as taught by Bolton et al. for heat protection since the coating materials are often very hot when spread.

23. Claim 80 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Matsushita as applied to claim 76 above, and further in view of Atkins.

The patent to Atkins teaches a vehicle having a chain and sprocket steering system. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated into the vehicle of Veath, Sr. and Matsushita a chain and sprocket steering system as taught by Atkins since Atkins teaches that such

Art Unit: 3752

arrangements are known to one of ordinary skill in the art and the vehicle of Veath, Sr. and Matsushita would function properly with such arrangements.

24. Claim 82 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Matsushita as applied to claim 76 above, and further in view of Arnold. Arnold teaches a vehicle comprising a steering system which provides a 360 degree rotatability about an axis substantially orthogonal to the axis of rotation of the wheels for translational movement of the vehicle (Column 5, lines 13-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. and Matsushita by providing a 360 degree rotatability for the front wheel as taught by Arnold for translational movement of the vehicle.

25. Claim 85 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Matsushita as applied to claim 76 above, and further in view of Carrier. The patent to Carrier teaches a fire fighting vehicle having a tank with fire-retarding chemicals which is capable of producing at least 34,000 liters of fire-suppressing foam. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the vehicle of Veath, Sr. and Matsushita by providing enough chemicals in order to produce at least 34,000 liters of foam as taught by Carrier in order to provide adequate amounts of fire fighting foam.

26. Claim 87 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Matsushita as applied to claim 76 above, and further in view of Forsyth.

Art Unit: 3752

Forsyth teaches a fire fighting vehicle which is capable of being airlifted to a destination. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the vehicle of Veath, Sr. Matsushita by providing at least one attachment point for airlifting and airdropping the vehicle as taught by Forsyth in order to quickly place the vehicle a particular location to fight fires.

27. Claim 88 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Matsushita as applied to claim 76 above, and further in view of Willard, Jr. Willard, Jr. teaches a run-flat tire which demonstrates improved vehicle performance under deflated conditions and yet achieves the same vehicle performance as a standard tire when inflated. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. and Matsushita by using runflat tires as taught by Willard, Jr. in order to provide demonstrates improved vehicle performance under deflated conditions and achieve the same vehicle performance as a standard tire when inflated.

28. Claims 93, 95, 98, 100, 101, 103, and 107-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr.

The patent to Veath, Sr. discloses a vehicle including a fluid delivery tank comprising a modular auxiliary tank, an engine, and three wheels (Column 6, lines 44-45) making a triangular wheel base as recited in claim 39. Each of the three wheels is driven by its own hydraulic motor (Column 7, lines 4-11), which will provide left and right brakes wherein the brakes comprise separate controllability. Veath, Sr. does not disclose the vehicle as being a fire-fighting emergency response vehicle, however, it has been held

Art Unit: 3752

that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Veath, Sr. does not disclose the dimensions as recited in claim 98. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have made the front wheel according to dimensions claimed, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component which is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art when there is no disclosure as to the criticality of such a modification. Providing a wedge shaped front nose is a matter of design choice since it involves a change in the shape of an object which is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art and the weight recited in claim 109 would have been an obvious matter of design choice depending on the desired weight of the vehicle.

29. Claim 94 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Fuller.

Fuller teaches a fire fighting vehicle comprising a frame 12 supporting a removable tank 16. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. by providing the recited limitations such the tank is removable from the vehicle since this concept is taught by Fuller in order to clean or replace the tank as necessary.

30. Claim 96 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Bolton

Art Unit: 3752

The patent to Bolton et al. teaches providing fire resistant windows to vehicles for fire protection. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. and Matsushita by providing a fire resistant window as taught by Bolton et al. for heat protection since the coating materials are often very hot when spread.

31. Claim 97 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Atkins.

Atkins teaches a vehicle having a chain and sprocket steering system. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated into the vehicle of Veath, Sr. a chain and sprocket steering system as taught by Atkins since Atkins teaches that such arrangements are known to one of ordinary skill in the art and the vehicle of Veath, Sr. would function properly with such arrangements.

32. Claim 99 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Arnold.

Arnold teaches a vehicle comprising a steering system which provides a 360 degree rotatability about an axis substantially orthogonal to the axis of rotation of the wheels for translational movement of the vehicle (Column 5, lines 13-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. by providing a 360 degree rotatability for the front wheel as taught by Arnold for translational movement of the vehicle.

Art Unit: 3752

33. Claim 102 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Carrier.

The patent to Carrier teaches a fire fighting vehicle having a tank with fire-retarding chemicals which is capable of producing at least 34,000 liters of fire-suppressing foam. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the vehicle of Veath, Sr. by providing enough chemicals in order to produce at least 34,000 liters of foam as taught by Carrier in order to provide adequate amounts of fire fighting foam.

34. Claim 104 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Forsyth.

Forsyth teaches a fire fighting vehicle which is capable of being airlifted to a destination. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the vehicle of Veath, Sr. by providing at least one attachment point for airlifting and airdropping the vehicle as taught by Forsyth in order to quickly place the vehicle a particular location to fight fires.

35. Claim 105 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Willard, Jr.

Willard, Jr. teaches a run-flat tire which demonstrates improved vehicle performance under deflated conditions and yet achieves the same vehicle performance as a standard tire when inflated. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. and by using runflat tires as taught by Willard, Jr. in order to provide demonstrates improved vehicle



Art Unit: 3752

performance under deflated conditions and achieve the same vehicle performance as a standard tire when inflated.

36. Claim 106 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veath, Sr. in view of Matsushita.

Matsushita teaches a vehicle steering control system comprising left and right brakes and control valves for separately controlling the left and right brakes in order to obtain smooth turning performance. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Veath, Sr. and Arnold by incorporating left and right brakes wherein the brakes are separately controlled as taught by Matsushita in order to provide a smooth turning performance.

#### ***Conclusion***

37. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Davis Hwu whose telephone number is 703-305-1663. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Y. Mar can be reached on (703)308-2087. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9302.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0861.



Davis Hwu